UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/322,321	05/28/1999	TONIA MORRIS	042390.P6888	7825

7590 11/06/2003

EXAMINER
GENCO, BRIAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2615	11

GEORGE G C TSENG
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/322,321	Applicant(s) MORRIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian C Genco	Art Unit 2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 23-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 23-30 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Applicant's amendment filed October 2, 2003 has been fully considered by the Examiner but is not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's amendment has overcome Examiners objection to the drawings and specification.

Applicants amendments have further overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 23, 26, 27, and 30 as well as the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 23-30. As such, new grounds of rejection will be presented bellow.

The official notice presented in the previous action stating that it is extremely well known in the art to use color filters with image sensors in order to produce color images was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of fact.

The official notice presented in the previous action stating that it is extremely well known to use the Bayer color filter pattern in order to produce images with higher green sensitivity and thus having higher sensitivity to the human eye was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of fact.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 23-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (USPN 4,609,825 to Berger et al.) in view of (US PG-PUB 2003/0193597 to Fossum et al.) in further view of (USPN 4,709,259 to Suzuki).

In regards to claim 23 Berger et al., herein Berger discloses an integrated circuit comprising:

a pixel array (e.g., see Fig. 1);

a first reset shift register having a plurality of outputs, each output being coupled to control a reset of sensor elements that are in a respective one of the rows of the array (e.g., element 4 of Fig. 1);

a wordline shift register having a plurality of outputs, each output being coupled to control a readout of the sensor elements that are in a respective one of the rows of the array (e.g., element 5 of Fig. 1);

control logic coupled to feed (a) the first shift register with a reset bit and (b) the wordline shift register with a read bit, and to operate the reset and wordline shift registers so that the reset bit and the read bit shift through their respective registers while an image frame is being captured, with the reset bit always being one or more rows ahead of the read bit to mark the start of integration, wherein the control logic is to program the reset bit and the read bit to set the integration time independently for different lines (e.g., column 4, lines 24-30 and 52-60; column 5, lines 14-27; Fig. 2).

Berger does not disclose that the reset bit is used for generating a correlated double sampling (CDS) reset value. In contrast, Berger discloses draining the reset charges (column 4, lines 24-30 and 52-60). It is extremely well known in the art to use the reset bit in order to

generate a CDS reset value as taught by Fossum et al. Fossum et al., herein Fossum, discloses sampling a reset voltage at the end of integration in order to reduce various noise introduced into the signals (paragraphs 0028, 0029, and 0033).

Neither Berger nor Fossum disclose a color sensor array having a plurality of sensor elements of different first and second colors, arranged in rows and columns, wherein the first reset shift register is used to control the integration time of the first color and a second reset shift register is used to control the integration time of the second color.

Suzuki discloses a color image sensor wherein the integration time for each color is adjustable so as to increase the dynamic range of the sensor (column 2, lines 17-21). This is accomplished by having separate registers for each color so as to reset all of the colors at the same time to start the integration period and to read out the colors at their respective integration times as depicted in Fig. 3 (e.g., column 4, lines 6-41; column 5, line 27 – column 6, line 16); Figs. 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to have had separate reset shift registers for each color so as to enable variable exposure times not only on different lines but on different colors as well thereby increasing the dynamic range of the sensor. As such, for at least the red and green colors two reset bits would be needed, one to mark the start of integration as taught by both Berger and Suzuki and the other to perform CDS at the end of the integration period as taught by Fossum.

In regards to claim 24 see Fig. 1 of Suzuki.

In regards to claim 25 see examines notes on the above rejections. Note that the combined teaching of Berger and Suzuki teach to have a reset shift register for each color. Note further that Suzuki discloses using the Bayer color filter wherein all three colors are present on

any one given line. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that three reset metal lines would be used for each row. As such there are two reset metal lines for each row.

In regards to claims 27-29 see examines notes on the above rejections.

Claims 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (USPN 4,609,825 to Berger et al.) in view of (US PG-PUB 2003/0193597 to Fossum et al.) in further view of (USPN 4,709,259 to Suzuki) in further view of (USPN 5,541,645 to Davis).

In regards to claims 26 and 30 see Examiners notes on the rejections above. Examiner notes that it is known in the art that in conventional lighting the blue color typically has the lowest intensity thus has the longest integration time. Davis discloses that since this is the case, in order to have a time efficient image sensor, and minimize dead time one would only want to reset the blue color once (e.g., column 5, line 26 – column 6, line 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have only had one reset for the blue reset register, or third reset register, in order to minimize dead time and thus have a time efficient image sensor.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian C. Genco who can be reached by phone at 703-305-7881 or by fax at 703-746-8325. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30am to 4:30 pm and every other Friday 7:30am to 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on 703-308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is 703-308-4357.

Brian C Genco
Examiner
Art Unit 2615

October 30, 2003

ANDREW CHRISTENSEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600